

# Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. xxv. 10.

VOLUME II.]

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1856.

[NUMBER 4.

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

## Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do. ....	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do. ....	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do. ....	10.00

Payments in advance.

All letters must be post-paid.

Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps deducting postage.

## THE DUTIES OF ABOLITIONISTS AT THE COMING ELECTION.

SECOND LETTER FROM THE EDITOR.

Addressed to Radical Abolitionists, &c.

Dear Brethren—Long as was my first letter, I did not finish what I wished to say to you. Have patience with me while I say a few words more. I will begin where I left off, and pursue the train of thought which was interrupted when I closed. I must say something of another false maxim of policy.

### SELECTING NO CANDIDATES OBNOXIOUS FOR THEIR REFORMATORY ANTECEDENTS.

The maxim of "attempting to take only one step at a time," "concealing the real intention," makes it requisite to select candidates who have contracted no odium by their advocacy of the measures to be concealed or repudiated. In 1848, such abolition candidates as Birney or Smith must be set aside, so as not to prejudice the movement of the Free-Soilers. And, in 1856, such Free Soil candidates as Hale, Chase, Seward, Giddings, Sumner, and their associates, must be set aside so as not to prejudice the Republicans, who were to rally on a lower platform than that of their predecessors. Thus the "one step at a time" policy becomes a series of successive retreats, until the merit of having been a successful commander in the wicked Mexican war, so loudly condemned by abolitionists and free soilers, becomes the sure passport to their support, while the champions of their own principles and measures are all set aside for no fault but their fidelity! The present champions of "free Kansas," by this rule, will have to be set aside as soon as Kansas comes in as a slave state—and such worthies as Stringfellow, Atchinson, or Buford, may be regarded as being already in the line of succession for the Presidency, by Northern acclamation, whenever it shall become necessary to rally for the defence of freedom in Nebraska and Minnesota! The mention of such names, in such a connection,

now, cannot sound more strangely than the name of Fremont would have done, to the approving readers of "Jay's Mexican War," one year ago. Examine the volume for yourselves, and judge.

Already the Democratic Border Ruffian Editors are making capital out of such facts. Already are they boasting that abolitionists and free soilers have been driven from their former "issues," and no longer contend for the measures upon which they rallied, at the elections, two years ago. Already they charge upon the Republican members of the House, that though they were elected to oppose the fugitive slave bill, to abolish slavery in the Federal District, to stop the inter-State slave trade, to repeal the Kansas-Nebraska Act, yet not an effort has been made by them to introduce any one of these measures. The very natural inference is, that they will soon be as quiet about Kansas as they now are of those other issues, and will be as ashamed of the leaders of this movement as they now are of the leaders of those former ones. Their desertion of their tried and trusty leaders, to take up new and uncommitted candidates, proclaims to all reflecting men that there is nothing permanent, nothing reliable, nothing *progressive*, but quite the reverse, in such tactics.

### CORRUPTING INFLUENCE OF THIS POLICY.

Who can fail to see the corrupting and deteriorating influences of such a policy? The friends of liberty, as they profess to be, raise a loud cry against the unfaithfulness of our rulers, and then practically discountenance and proscribe political fidelity! They despise "dough-faces," time-servers, conservatists, and timid or neutral men, who fail to take a bold and manly stand for emancipation and freedom. At least they say they do. And then they select—or follow the lead of those who assume to select for them—such candidates as are deemed to be "available" for the very reason that they have never made themselves odious by hazarding their popularity for the sake of freedom!—Thus they bid a premium for "dough-faces," and transform their whole political machinery, nominating conventions, journals, and ballots, into one grand national institution for the growth, the education, and the patronizing of dough-faces! They profess to desire and pray for good rulers, "faithful men"—"just men, fearing God and hating covetousness," and then they pursue a systematic course which, if continued, renders it morally impossible that such rulers should ever come into power, in this country, without a revolution or a miracle.

Even among "Radical Abolitionists," it has almost grown into a settled axiom, that no true and trustworthy abolitionist is ever to expect

an opportunity of holding any of the official stations which must be thus occupied, before slavery can be peacefully abolished! I should like to know whether any other class of earnest political reformers were ever before known to talk or to act in this manner?

In the earlier days of our Republic, when men earnestly espoused principles, and honestly demanded corresponding measures, who ever heard of such a thing as the shrewd policy of nominating or supporting a candidate not known as the zealous advocate and able exponent of the cherished principles and the desired measures? What would have been thought of the Constitutionalists or Federalists, who desired a new Constitution, if they had been ashamed to nominate as their leaders, the political "pathfinders" of their chosen theory of government—their Washingtons and their Adamsses, but had set them aside as "unavailable" because they were denounced as monarchists and enemies of "State rights," preferring others whose political opinions were less determinate, and less odious in the eyes of their opponents? Who would then have accomplished the work or effected the objects attained by that class of statesmen? By whom would the Constitution have been formed or adopted, or what would have been its complexion?

Or, what would have been thought of the "State Rights" or Republican (now Democratic) party, if they too, had set aside their own Jefferson, the great champion and exponent of their political creed and policy, because he, too, was denounced as an enemy of the Constitution, a disorganizer and an infidel, and was exceedingly odious in the eyes of their adversaries? Suppose they had dropped Jefferson, and had substituted some person of no political antecedents that any body could object against,—do you think there would ever have been the Revolution of 1801, or that the "Republican" or "Democratic" party, would ever have had a place in our history?

No! Whenever political reformers are thoroughly in earnest, they never go out of their own ranks for their candidates—nor fail to select as their leaders their most able, most consistent, most uncompromising men—the very men whom the opposition most fear, and most villify. Whenever a generation of "Radical Abolitionists" shall arise who are as sternly bent upon securing their grand object, as the old Federalists and Republicans were upon securing theirs, it will be in vain for any body out of their own ranks to intermeddle in the selection of Presidential candidates for them, and equally in vain to bring forward any name not already identified with the movement, and efficient in helping it forward.



"BUT WE ARE SO FEW IN NUMBER!"

But how came it to pass that you are so few in number? How few are you? And how do you know what your numbers are?

You polled 60,000 votes for Birney in 1844, and *would* have polled at least 600,000 that year, but for the prevalence of the same false principles and false maxims against which I am here contending. Had that same 60,000 stood firm in 1848, their numbers might have been easily swelled to three or four hundred thousand, in four years. Had these stood firm in 1852, their numbers might have been more than doubled. And, by 1856, we might have polled for Gerrit Smith, or some such man, as many as will now be polled for Fremont.—Nay, had we but repeated in 1852 our 60,000 vote of 1844, we might have gone into the late Pittsburgh and Philadelphia Conventions with an influence that would have moulded the platform and selected the candidate. As it is, we have forfeited our influence with the less radical opponents of pro-slavery aggression, by voting in opposition to our professions.

I know I am not alone in these estimates. In the leading part of them I have had the concurrence of prominent men now in the "Republican" ranks. Out of many instances I will select one. Of the dozen or half dozen Liberty party leaders who succeeded in effecting the transfer of its main numerical force to the "Free Soil" party in 1848, S. P. Chase of Ohio, (now Gov. Chase) was one, and the principal. In 1853, he said to me, of his own accord, without my introducing the subject, that he was then convinced that a great mistake had been made, by that movement. He did not blame himself and his associates. They did what they thought was best. They could not foresee the defection of the Van Burens and others who had gone back to the "barn burners," and thence to the old "Democratic" party. "But," said he, "if we had all stuck to the old Liberty party, we could have polled more votes on that platform, now, than the Free Soil party has ever polled." I violate no confidence in relating this conversation, which was in presence of strangers incidentally in the Anti-Slavery office in this city, as well as in the presence of several abolitionists and Free Soilers. I know it is the belief of a number of prominent politicians of different parties, in different States, that if the Liberty Party had stood firm, and kept together, it would have carried the free States, before now. I do not see how it could have been otherwise.

It has been my lot to hold very extensive communication by letter with abolitionists in all parts of the free States, and I have travelled extensively in several of them. It is my habit to converse with citizens in general, on the subject, and *I do know*, from long and painful experience, that the grand obstacle to the general acceptance of our principles, is the fact that so few abolitionists honor their professions at the polls, especially at Presidential elections. Ask a Whig to become an abolitionist, and he would tell you that the platform of *his* party was about the same as that of the "Free Soil" party with which the abolitionists mainly voted.—(And this reminds me that an article is now going the rounds of the Republican papers, claiming that the "Republican" platform is the

same that the late Whig platform, on slavery, used to be. And the National Era is showing that the "Republican" platform is the same as that of Henry Clay.)

Remonstrate with a Democrat, and he would point you to the Resolutions of many a Northern Democratic Convention, against the extension of slavery, and this, he would add, is all that the abolitionists themselves, go for, *when they vote*, as they do, with the Free Soil party.

Ask a Garrisonian to examine our views of the Constitution, and he will tell you that our theory of the Constitution amounts to nothing, so long as nearly all who profess to hold it, vote as if they did not believe it. And thus all classes excuse themselves from becoming Radical Abolitionists, because they consider our doctrine a mere "abstraction" that nobody thinks of reducing to practice.

More than this, it is difficult to make the mass of the people believe that abolitionists are honest and in earnest, while they witness so general and so wide a disparity between their professions and their practice.

But how do you know that Radical Abolitionists are too few to effect any thing by a concentration of their votes? By what standard do you measure your neighbors? You doubtless judge of them just as Whigs, Democrats, Free Soilers do! You count only those who vote for their principles, and by that test you ascertain that there are very few of them! You exclude, perhaps, even yourself!

But if you count all who, in conversation, will tell you that they believe the Radical Abolitionists are correct, there are vastly more of them than is commonly understood. How, you will ask, is this proved? (1st.) The great bulk of the Liberty party in New York and New England, before they went off to the Free Soil party, had adopted the "radical" views, and they commonly profess to hold them still. (2d.) Of other "free soilers" the greater part are ready, in conversation, to yield up the point. (3d.) The more intelligent portion of Whigs and Democrats in New York and New England, admitted the truth of the doctrine years ago.—(4th.) The doctrine has made great and rapid progress within two years past, as we learn, by letters, from all quarters. Our travelling agents meet with very few, of any party, who controvert the doctrine. Free Soilers and Republicans, with few exceptions, object only on the ground of present expediency, and because they think there are so few who agree with them! Not co-operating with each other on that subject, they know not each other's sentiments, just as other sorts of people would not know each other, if they did not vote together! Ask any Democrat or any Republican how many there are of his views in his county, and he could only tell you by the number of their votes. (He would count, too, all the abolitionists who voted with him.) Until Radical Abolitionists *vote together*, their numbers can never be counted. A friend who had been through his county, wrote us lately—"At least three-fourths of all the voters in this county will avow that they are in sentiment, Radical Abolitionists, and that they would greatly prefer to vote for the Radical candidate, but they think, (and cannot be beat out of it,) that they are so few in number, that

they can do nothing!" Similar testimony, in substance, comes from different parts of the country.

But what if it were otherwise? If we must defer voting till we find out that we are a majority, it is manifest we must defer it indefinitely and forever. And if we may defer discharging our duty at the polls, because we are few in number, then we may defer any other duty, for the same reason. God does not require us to be a majority, *but he does require us to be and to exemplify what a majority ought to be*. In no other way can we have any real influence by our writing and lecturing on the duties of the majority.

And this furnishes an answer to another common maxim among pro-Slavery-voting abolitionists. They say

"WE MUST SAVE OUR INFLUENCE!"

We must vote with the Republicans in order to have influence with them."

Just so the majority of abolitionists said in 1840 in reference to their voting with the Whigs, and Democrats. The result was that nine-tenths of them became *mere* Whigs and Democrats and soon ceased making any pretense of being abolitionists. Of those who voted in the same way in 1844, the greater part did no better. If they retained the profession they retained nothing else. No fact is better established than this, that when an abolitionist gives up voting for abolition, on any of the pleas now under review, he soon ceases (as a general fact) to contribute any thing to the promotion of the anti-slavery cause. And this is the grand reason why less than one fourth part of what was contributed fifteen years ago, is contributed now, with all the seeming progress that has been made. Men will not long continue to give money, where they do not vote. "Show me thy faith without thy works and I will show you my faith by my works."—Voting unites testimony with action. It is both saying and doing. It is the link which unites preaching with practice.

"Preserve your influence, by talking one way and acting another?"—Nonsense! You are losing your influence by so doing. Abolitionists, as already shown, have lost nearly all their influence in this way. Why should your neighbors quit their path to walk in yours, so long as you will walk with them in theirs?

"BUT THE PEOPLE ARE NOT YET PREPARED FOR IT!"

And no wonder they are not, so long as they see that *you*, who preach abolition to them, are not yet prepared for it!

"WE MUST FIRST ABOLITIONIZE THE PEOPLE, AND THEN CARRY THE QUESTION TO THE POLLS."

But how do you expect to "abolitionize the people" so long as your preaching is contradicted by your practice? How do you expect to make "radical" abolitionists of them, while you vote as if you did not yourself believe the doctrine, or did not think it practicable, or of any vital importance?

And what do you call "abolitionizing" the people? Or making "radical" abolitionists of them?

Is it to get them to say that our doctrines are correct, while they continue to vote just as they did before? This is like the missionary



policy of the American Board, in their work of converting the heathen—make Christians of them—get them into the Church, and then some time or other, try to persuade them to quit their polygamy and their slaveholding.

For my own part, I confess I have no very great desire to be instrumental in making such converts. We have probably *above half a million* of them now, who are voters, and who nevertheless, are ready, with few exceptions, to vote for a Presidential candidate "irrevocably opposed" to a national abolition of American Slavery. What good does it do to make such converts? How does it benefit the slave? How does it honor God? How does it honor the truth? How does it honor the cause? How does it benefit the converts? Will God hold them less guilty for their pro-slavery votes, now that they know the truth, than he would if they did not know it?

"BUT HAVE YOU NO PREFERENCE BETWEEN BUCHANAN AND FREMONT?"

What has that to do with the great question before us? So long as I know and you know, or ought to know, that it is wrong to vote for either of them, of what use is it, for you or for me to parley with temptation by trying to find out which of them is farthest from being such a candidate as God would have me vote for—"a just man ruling in the fear of God"—and "executing judgment for the oppressed?"—Of what use is it for either of us to attempt to conjecture—what no finite mind can determine—which of them, if elected, would take the course productive of the greatest ultimate evil? If I *could* foresee which, it would not alter my duty.

Suppose it to be highly probable that Buchanan, if elected, would produce the greatest amount of immediate evil—yes, suppose it were certain that this would be the case, *that* would not determine the ultimate bearing of that event upon "the greatest amount of good" or of evil in the long run. For it might still be true that that immediate evil might push up the people to the employment of the only true remedy which they would otherwise reject, to their ruin. And it might be true that the immediate comparative benefits, (seeming or real) arising from the election of Fremont might quiet the people, put them off their guard, and prevent their adoption of the only true remedy, until, by the accumulation of the national sin, the nation was destroyed.—God only knows how this would be. I do not know. And if I did know, it would not alter my duty. If I *did* know that the election of Buchanan would *thus* result in the abolition of slavery and the salvation of the country, that knowledge would give me no right to vote for Buchanan. Or if I did know that, under an overruling Providence, the election of Fremont, by holding present aggressions somewhat in check, and giving more time for better influences to operate, would *thus* save the country, that knowledge would give me no right to vote for Fremont. In neither case may I "do evil that good may come." It is not *my* business to control the universe. God will do that. My business is to do what God bids me, and leave the event to him, accepting and improving the coming event, whatever it may be, in the best manner, when it comes.

Thus much for the things that I do *not* know. Now, for the things that I *do* know. I know

God is dealing with this nation for the sin of permitting the enslavement of three and a half millions of my brethren. I know that the troubles in Kansas have come upon us, as a national punishment for this national sin. I know that Col. Fremont and his party promise to deliver us, by their prowess and wisdom, from this Divine judgment, by a course of policy which includes their promise, and the promise of those who co-operate with them, to take no national measures for a national abolition of this national sin. And I know that no nation, nor President, nor political party has ever yet hardened themselves against God, and (in the long run) prospered.

#### VII. MISCELLANEOUS CONSIDERATIONS.

Having thus laid down the first principles of right political action, having stated the case, and brought it to the test of those principles, having disposed of some of the false assumptions, false principles, and false maxims of policy, upon which the claims of moral principle are so extensively set aside in practice, it remains for me to present some considerations that have not yet received distinct and adequate attention.

#### MISCHIEFS OF COMPROMISE.

I have already shown how and wherein the cause of abolition has, in many ways, suffered damage, and has almost been shipwrecked, by the compromising course of its advocates, at the ballot box. But I am not yet done with that subject. When I showed how our numbers had been diminished, how our influence had been forfeited by our voting, to so great an extent, with the advocates of temporizing expedients, I expressed my confident belief that an uncompromising course would have enabled us, as radical abolitionists, to have carried the now pending Presidential election, instead of suffering it to hinge upon the low issue presented by the "Republicans."

#### COMPROMISE INVITES AGGRESSION.

I will now go further than this. There is not the slightest reason to believe that if radical abolitionists had lived up to their professions, if they had voted for their own principles, if they had thus retained, *by their self-consistency*, their original faith, courage, self-respect, self-denial, enterprise, efficiency, and influence, the country would ever have been presented with the specific "issue" upon which the present controversy between the Buchanan and the Fremont parties is made to turn. No such "Platform" as that of the Republican Conventions at Pittsburg and Philadelphia would ever have been heard of, for there would never have been any occasion or pretext for it. The Border Ruffian invasion of Kansas would never have occurred, and for this very good reason: the Kansas Nebraska bill which instigated it, would never have been passed nor attempted. The Slave Power, as before, would have had enough to do, in acting upon the defensive, against the assaults of abolitionists.

#### EVIDENCE FROM HISTORY.

The anti-slavery movement began, distinctively, in 1833. It was for the abolition of slavery where it already existed, not merely to prevent its extension. It demanded "immediate and unconditional emancipation," not a separation of the North from the South. In its first National Convention, it made a National appeal. It said

—"There are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting on the people of the free States to remove slavery, by moral and political action, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States." The details of action were not as clearly defined, then, as afterwards. But the fixed purpose was distinctly announced, and understood. As early as 1836 the power of the Federal Government over slavery in the States was boldly affirmed by writers in the Anti-Slavery Quarterly Magazine of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The rifling of the mails, the gags, mobs, the attempts to kidnap abolitionists, the demand that their meetings and publications should be put down by State action at the North—these revealed the Slave Power alarmed, and *acting on the defensive*, while the abolitionists were the assailants. Thus stood the parties, till the mass of abolitionists were seduced to act only on the *defensive*. Then the tables were turned.

The annexation of Texas, first attempted in 1837, was staved off, for eight years, mainly, if not solely, by the fear of abolition votes, and the dread of a growing and powerful abolition party. The aggregate of legal voters, enrolled in the anti-slavery societies was known to be large and rapidly increasing. In 1839, they were estimated at several hundreds of thousands. It was also known that they contemplated distinct political action, and that, they remonstrated strongly against the annexation of Texas, while they likewise demanded liberation in the Territories and Federal District, as well as the interdiction of the domestic slave trade. To pacify them, strong demonstrations were made by Whigs and Democrats at the North, particularly by the Whigs, against the annexation of Texas. The public journals of that period, as well as speeches in Congress, attest the fact that this was deemed a politic measure for holding back the aggressive political action of northern abolitionists against slavery. This constituted the burthen of the apology and the entreaty urged by northern whigs and democrats with the Southern wings of their respective parties. "We must yield or postpone this Texas question, said Democrats, till this agitation of the slave question has subsided." "There must be something done"—said the Whigs, "to quiet and secure the abolitionists, or the Whig party is blown to atoms." To the abolitionists they said "Half a loaf is better than no bread. You must do one thing at a time. The 'present issue' is to keep out Texas." The Whigs went still further than this. They found it "available" to season their "non-extension" tactics with almost any amount of anti-slavery talk. So well was this understood between Whigs, North and South; aye, and Democrats, too, that William Slade of Vermont could deliver himself, leisurely and quietly, of a full length anti-slavery lecture, in the House of Representatives, without interruption or sensation, as it was well understood, beforehand, that the speech was made for the North, and was to wind up with an exhortation to abolitionists to vote for Henry Clay. The leanness of the abolition vote for Birney, in 1840, had been attributed in part, to the divisions among abolitionists, the novelty of the policy, and the incompleteness of organization. Yet that leanness encouraged a renewed effort for the annexation of Texas in 1841-2. The prospect of a heavy abolition vote in 1844, however, held the slave power in check, until the election returns dispelled the apprehension, as well it might do. It was found that scarcely a tenth part of the abolition vote had been polled for the abolition candidate. Three fourths of it, in compliance with Whig advice, had been given "for



Henry Clay, to keep out Texas,"\* and the vote had truly been "thrown away." The aggressive policy had been exchanged for the defensive. This was all the slaveholders desired. The way for the annexation of Texas was all open and clear. That measure, which a conservative Senate had not dared to consummate, in April 1844, lest the Presidential election should suffer damage, was carried by joint action of both houses, March 1st, 1845, in less than four months after it was ascertained that abolitionists would not vote for their principles; and had practically relinquished abolition, for non-extension.

Texas, as a slave state, was annexed, and War was waged against Mexico, because abolitionists in general pursued the same policy, in 1844, that they repeated in 1848, and in 1852, and are apparently preparing to repeat again, in 1856.

The proposed rescue from slavery of the conquered Mexican provinces, by Mr. Wilmot's celebrated proviso, though it twice passed the lower House, in 1846, was at last lost in that body, the proviso being dropped, by a vote of 102 to 97, no less than 22 members absenting themselves, who had been expected to stand by the measure. Who that understands American politics and parties can doubt that a firm, vigorous, and growing abolition party, casting even 300,000 votes for Birney, in 1844—(only one half of what would have been cast, but for the prevalence of the false principle and maxims I am now opposing) would have controlled those 22 stray votes, and secured freedom for Texas?

The sequel of the story is easily told. In 1848 the available force of the Liberty Party was drawn off into the newly organized Free Soil party, in which all aggressive movements against slavery were either suspended or abandoned, for the merely defensive issue of "No more slave states and no more slave territory."—From that moment the Slave Power took courage, and entered upon the successful career of aggression which now culminates in outrages for the extinction of freedom in Kansas, under patronage of the Federal authorities.

The "compromise measures of 1850," so called, were the natural outgrowth of this policy. Had there been a vigorous abolition party instead of a Free Soil party in the field, there would have been no struggle for the admission of California as a free state—to say nothing of the anticipation of that question by the adoption of the Wilmot proviso, which might easily have been secured, as before noticed. What but the pusillanimous and temporizing policy of their opponents, could have emboldened the slaveholders to attempt so absurd and daring a scheme as that of excluding a state because it was *not* a slave state? Who would have believed it possible, a few years previous, when all slavery stood trembling before the abolitionists? To the same cause may be traced the successful enactment of the Fugitive Slave bill. Had the Slave Power been kept on the defensive, as in 1836, the field of its operations would have remained nearer home.

So too, of the passage of the Kansas Nebras-

\* Henry Clay failed of being elected, and would have failed, if the balance of the anti-slavery votes had been cast for him. And if he had been elected, there is no reason to believe that it would have prevented the annexation of Texas.

ka bill, the invasion of freedom North of 36 deg. 30 min.—the attempts to annul, by the action of the Federal Courts, the abolition acts of Pennsylvania and New York—to open, under Federal authority, the African Slave trade, and thus protect the slave driver on Bunker hill.

Nothing of all this could have been witnessed, if abolitionists had not invited these successive aggressions by their successive retreats, until the controverted ground is at length narrowed down to Kansas, and even this is more than half relinquished by the "Republicans" and those who act with them, as may be seen in the action of the House on Mr. Dunn's bill, the passage, without restriction, of the Army bill, and Mr. Speaker Banks' speech in Wall Street, falling back on the "Squatter Sovereignty" doctrine so recently denounced.

COMPROMISES INJURE THOSE WHO CONSENT OR  
SUBMIT TO THEM.

Bold measures enkindle enthusiasm and inspire the confidence of friends, while they dishearten and intimidate opposers. This is the secret, to day, of pro-slavery strength at the North and at the South, in Kansas and at the seat of government. Timid, hesitant, vacillating, retreating measures, have the contrary effect, and this is the secret of the disasters of freedom, for the last eleven years.

Not voting your principles will tend to weaken your own attachment to them, and perhaps even make you ingenious to get rid of them. You may be never so self-confident, but you cannot get rid of the operation of the laws of mind, nor of the records that attest their force. Nearly all the opposition now manifested (within the ranks of abolitionists, Free Soilers and Republicans) to the doctrine of National Responsibility and Constitutional Federal power over Slavery in the states, comes from men who were once advocates of the doctrine, but who found pretexts, of some sort, for not voting in accordance with it. I could illustrate this, not only in the case of Non-Resistants, Disunionists, and old Liberty party men who once advocated National Abolition, but concluded to vote with Whigs, with Democrats, or with Free Soilers, but also in the case of "Radical Abolitionists," who could zealously and eloquently defend the principle, six or eight months ago, but who, desiring to co-operate with their "Republican" friends, and perceiving the inconsistency of their position, have begun to cast about them for grounds of hesitancy and doubt in respect to the Constitutional question. They may not be aware of the origin of their new difficulties, but it is sufficiently obvious to others. Were it not too sad a subject for ridicule, it would be vastly amusing to dissect some dozens of letters I have received within a few months past. Some of them gravely question whether we have any National Government at all—whether the Constitution provides for any; or conveys any powers for that object—and whether the Constitution be anything more than a compact between the States, concerning what the States shall do or not do, but without any supervisory power over them.

"If any man will do my will he shall know of the doctrine." "If thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light." "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." These divine maxims are far more comprehensive in their scope than is commonly supposed. Their

application is as appropriate in the field of moral responsibility denominated *political*, and to the facts, truths, and principles therein embraced, as any where else. I mean no offensive impeachment of motives. But the influence of position upon opinion is well known. When an editor writes to me, "I yield from a pecuniary pressure"—when lecturers who do not yield write to me that the field is, every where, very nearly hedged up against them, until after election, and that the condition of getting a house to speak in is, that nothing be said against the platform of the "Republicans"—that numbers tell them, half laughingly yet seriously, that they dare not read the "Radical Abolitionist" till after the election, and others say that in order to 'go it' they are obliged to follow the nursery precept of "shut up your eyes and swallow quick,"—when straws like these are constantly passing in the same direction before me, can I doubt what it is that propels them, or what point of the compass the wind comes from? or what the moral effect will be upon those who suffer themselves to be driven before it?

#### "THE WHITE MAN'S PARTY."

It is no new thing for political parties in this Slavery-cursed country to decline recognizing the equal rights of free colored citizens. No parties except the Liberty Party and Liberty League have ever yet done otherwise, and neither of these have ever received a tythe of the votes of colored voting citizens. But the Republican party is the first and only party that, at the North, has ever taken special pains to plant itself openly upon the principle of making a broad distinction between white and colored citizens, making it a main feature of national policy to exclude the colored man from all the unimproved public domain of the vast North-West, declaring it forever and exclusively sacred to "the white man." I do not marvel when I see the leading colonizationists of the free States, clerical and laical, rushing into this party, renewing, on its altar, their old pledge to let slavery alone where it exists, to leave the slaves in their chains, and at the same altar pledging themselves to a separation of the white and colored races of the country. This is just what might naturally be expected of them. Unable, as they find themselves, to expatriate the colored people, they readily fall in with the novel and popular plan of preventing their further diffusion through the country, confining the remainder of them, in perpetuity to the South.

The spirit of caste at the North, was never before presented with an opportunity of self-gratification, at so cheap a rate. "Let the South keep their niggers to themselves, if they choose, and do what they please with them, and let the fugitive slave bill stand unrepealed, if they will only let us keep them from settling in the great North West." This is the pith and core of the "Republican movement"—the summary of its measures—the spirit that is to give it victory, if it comes into power.

When I see the colored people, led on by Frederick Douglass, preparing to run into *such* a party, as they never did into any other, and that too, while the leading Republican editors are evidently ashamed to announce that Frederick Douglass is supporting them, I am half tempted to conclude that they have made up their minds



to welcome, joyfully, any amount of political proscription that may be meted out to them.

But I check myself. I remember that the colored people only partake of the periodical mania that, once in four years, sweeps over the whole country, and that knows no distinction of color.

FOLLY OF WORLDLY WISDOM.

Were I to turn over the volumes of universal history for political illustrations of the Bible maxim that "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God," I doubt whether I could find an instance more striking, more direct to the point—certainly I could find none more applicable to our own times and country, than the one which, in this letter, and in my preceding one, I have been laboring to describe and expose. Ordinary demonstrations of worldly wisdom, in the management of public affairs are indeed sad enough. But, as I have already shown, worldly men, in the pursuit of their own selfish interests, are never known to adopt the suicidal policy that has characterized the political action of the masses of American Abolitionists. "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." The instincts of selfishness in the one case, are surer and stronger than the impulses of benevolence in the other.

Let us gather up into one view, the results of the policy I am deprecating. Abolitionists have departed from their principles in quest of numbers, and thereby have reduced themselves from more than half a million of voters to such a handful that they now find in that alleged fact their grand excuse for a continuance of the same policy! They went astray, in pursuit of influence, till, from a position in which they were shaking the nation, they have sunk into a state in which they say they can do nothing but drift along with others! In the noontide glory of the great Whig party, in 1840, that party dared not nominate its great idol, (almost the nation's idol) HENRY CLAY, because abolitionists had put their veto upon him. In 1856, when the Whig party is out of the way, and the course clear, the abolitionists, so far from having a voice in the selection of the Presidential candidate that is to receive the greater part of their votes, take it for granted that they have nothing to do but to support such candidates as colonizationists and pro-slavery editors have selected for them. They abandoned their principles and their measures, to escape ridicule, and by so doing have made themselves perfectly ridiculous. They sacrificed their principles to gain friends, till their friendship is no longer desired, nor sought after. They thought to win respect, but, from their high eminence in which their opponents were courting them, and claiming to be themselves abolitionists, they now find those upon whom they are obtruding their unsolicited friendship, ashamed of them, and expending nearly half their breath, type, and funds, for six months past, in contemptuous disclaimers of affinity with them. [Thus they reap the divinely predicted reward of their unfaithfulness—Them that honor me, I will honor, but they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.] They expected, by their sinful compliances, to assist in moulding the measures of the political parties devoted to slavery, and the consequence has been that they have not only failed of this,

but have not now the slightest influence in moulding the measures of the party that they recognise and co-operate with, as being opposed to the Slave Power. They imagined that by dropping or suspending the direct issue against Slavery, they could prevent its further extension, that they could "keep out Texas," pass the "Wilmot proviso," and prevent further aggressions by the Slave Power. But I have demonstrated from the history, that the very opposite of all this has been the result—that the restriction of slavery has been, in each specific instance, defeated by their compromising course of policy, and that each and every subsequent pro-slavery aggression, down to the last item of pro-slavery Federal outrage in Kansas and at Washington, has come upon us as the natural consequence, as well as the just Providential retribution of their guilty and absurd policy.

Oh! the consummate folly of man, gifted with reason, when he undertakes to be wiser than his Maker—when he attempts, by his own foresight of the future—by his own calculations of consequences, by his own skillful plans and expedients, to obtain results more safe, certain and beneficial than those which come, of necessity, from simple and confiding reliance upon the great laws of his being, under the operation of which he is placed, by the all wise Creator and supreme controller of all things, the arbiter of all human destinies! We have preachers profound and eloquent to descant on such folly in the individual transgressor, and in its bearing on the interests of eternity. Why can they not learn, like the ancient prophets, to detect and reprove the kindred guilt and folly, nay the same guilt and folly, of associated transgressors, in their influence upon the condition of social humanity, of States and nations, here, in this present world, over which the same God reigns, and by the same laws? How are the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdoms of Messiah—till they learn to do this?

DEPARTURES FROM THE BIBLE.

I have arraigned the course of policy I am describing as a violation of the first principles of moral right, to some of which I referred, near the beginning of my first letter. Those principles are clearly contained in the revealed word of God. To the specific precepts of that word I have likewise adverted, as "God's authoritative law of political action." And I cannot persuade myself to close these strictures, without again and earnestly insisting that no political action can be safe or trustworthy that is not in accordance with the specific directions as well as with the general principles and spirit of that blessed book.—What a lamentable error do those reformers commit who seem to think that reformatory measures, (whether political or otherwise) can be most advantageously and safely shaped without being strictly and rigidly conformed to the Bible! It is now nearly thirty years that my time and attention have been chiefly occupied with reformatory labors and measures. During all that time I have been solicitously observant of all the different phases and forms of reformatory efforts that have been exhibited before me, and of the constantly developing results of them. My own labors and investigations, I may say, without boasting, have afforded me some opportunities of learning by experiment. And if I have ascertained or

learned anything, in the past thirty years, it is this—that no experiment has failed or has been found defective that has been in strict accordance with the Bible, while no experiment has succeeded or has proved beneficial that has not been in accordance with the Bible.

The cause of Temperance made no perceptible progress, until it was, in some good measure, disentangled from those temporising and half-way expedients which resulted from a non-compliance with the radical ethics and uncompromising demands of the Bible. From that time, forward, it has encountered no serious obstacles that have not arisen from a neglect of the Bible. Incidental aids came from scientific investigations and testimonies, but no contested point—not even the wine question—has been correctly settled, until brought to the test of the Bible.

The cause of Abolition was first brought before the public, by men who cherished a profound reverence for the Bible, who made it the man of their council, their chief weapon and guide. So far as the cause has been thus conducted, it has been rightly and safely conducted, and no farther. Not an hair's breadth of departure from that divine standard, either on the right hand or on the left, has been indulged, without damage. Not a Satanic falsehood has confronted it, or sought to seduce or mislead it, that has not involved, at that precise point, a denial of the Bible, or a manifest departure from its plain teachings. Not a mistake has been committed by its friends, not a cavil has been brought forward by its enemies, that should not and could not have been corrected or answered, at once, by an honest, simple hearted appeal to the Bible. I give to these observations the widest possible scope. I instance the pleas of procrastination, the pretences of gradualism, the expedients of removing the victims of oppression instead of restraining the oppressors, of limiting or preventing the further spread of slavery instead of putting a stop to it, where it exists—of separating the races, of separating one part of the nation from another part of it, when God's simple command by the Bible is, and always has been—"Execute judgment"—"Deliver the spoiled"—"Break every yoke"—"Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." All these, and all other actual or conceivable substitutes, objections, and pleas, have been and are nothing more nor less than so many evasions or contradictions of the plain precepts of Divine Wisdom and Goodness in the Bible.

The field of political action furnishes no exception to these statements, but, on the other hand, the most signal exemplifications of them. It is for want of "Bible politics," wielded by the friends of the enslaved, that the slave is still in his chains, that Kansas is ravaged, that the friends of freedom are divided, or that they are concentrating their efforts on false issues.—It is in vain to urge upon them the necessity and the duty of united action, so long as they are encouraged to run after the thousand temporizing and conflicting expedients and compromises in respect to which the most subtle politicians differ; when they should follow, implicitly, those plain Bible directions which a child can understand, and which commend themselves



to the conscience and the common sense of all simple-hearted and sincere men—the only basis on which all true men can unite.

The class of Abolitionists who decry political action, yet urge the political measure of dissolving the Union, are charged with having rejected the Bible as a divine rule of belief and action. I am sorry to be unable to defend them from the charge, but must beg leave to inquire whether the great majority of abolitionists who condemn them for this, have *themselves* been careful to shape *their* political action in accordance with the principles and precepts of the Bible? In a review of the ground I have gone over, in these two letters, the question, I think, may be easily answered. And if it be found that they have not, is it not high time for them to manifest their care to steer clear of "infidel abolitionism" by strictly conforming their abolition measures to the Bible? Once more, let me ask them whether they have ever made it their systematic study to do this?

I will dismiss this topic, by affirming that the man who would be an honest, a strong, and a wise statesman, must give his days and his nights to the reverent study of the Bible—and that the citizen who would discharge his political duties, so as either to secure the liberties of his country, or to save his own soul from the polluting mire of the devil's politics, must stand sternly aloof from all politics not based upon the uncompromising morality of the Bible.—Above all things, the minister of the Gospel, who would not be a "blind leader of the blind," nor cry "peace, peace, when there is no peace," nor "daub with untempered mortar," but be "as God's mouth" to reprove national sins, must beware of the slough of worldly, wicked, compromising politics, and plant his feet on the righteous, unbending, straight forward, honest politics of the Bible.

#### OUR BRETHREN IN BONDS.

In conclusion, I must conjure you, as Christian abolitionists, who believe in civil government, and who hold to the constitutional duty of our National Government to secure the blessings of liberty to all the inhabitants—to remember them that are in bonds as bound with them, when you go to the ballot box. Make their case your own. Bear in mind that they are the representatives of your Savior, and that your treatment of them, will be regarded by him, as your treatment of himself. I am aware that you may say that your vote for their relief would not secure that relief for them at present. But the question is whether you will insult their misery, and cast the influence of your vote against their future relief, by consenting to their enslavement for four years longer, by voting with the Fremont party, and thus placing yourselves, so far as they are concerned, precisely on the same level with the Buchanan party which you so justly and so loudly condemn? Consider whether you will practically say to them—what a distinguished Christian philanthropist, well known and beloved in both hemispheres, has just now told me he would be compelled to imagine himself as saying to them, should he vote with the "Republican" party.

"I imagine myself," said he, "in the rice swamps of Georgia, or in a field of sugar cane in Louisiana. I find the slaves clustering round

"me, to inquire what we are doing at the North for them. I tell them we have formed a great 'Republican party, to displace the old Democratic party that now crushes them. The slaves ask 'And what will you do for us, with your 'Republican party, when it comes into power? 'Will you set us at liberty?' I tell him, No. 'What! none of us?' I answer him, No.—'Will you take off any of our present burdens?' No. 'What, then, will you do for us?' I tell him, We will not allow the further extension of slavery. And what does that mean? they inquire. It means that we will not let your masters carry you up, north, into Kansas, where there is dry land, and pure air, and sweet cool water. We will take care that none of you come up to settle, in our beautiful and healthful country, at the North-West. But we will hem you in, here, with your children and children's children, and keep you and keep them where you now are, pent up in these pestilential swamps, and in these hot canefields, and in these sugar houses, till the soil is exhausted, and your masters become so poor that they can't feed you nor clothe you any longer. Then, slavery will 'die out,' and there will be no slaves left in the country. Slavery will 'die out,' because the slaves and their masters will be starved out, or unable to keep the country, and somebody else will take possession of it, instead of them."

Now then, if you knew that your Savior and his apostles, and the noble army of the martyrs, and the goodly fellowship of the elders mentioned in the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, were all down there, together, in Louisiana and Georgia, and held as slaves, do you think that the professions and prospects of the Republican party would persuade you to vote fetters on them, for four years longer?—No! I am sure you would not do it. But Christ says—"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me."

WILLIAM GOODELL.

#### FEDERAL PROTECTION.

"Is it not high time we had a Government intent on protecting the rights of life, liberty and property, as well as of satisfying the unbearable exactions of slave-breeders?"—*N. Y. Tribune*, Aug. 19.

The Tribune very properly makes this inquiry at the close of some remarks in reference to a recent outrage upon liberty that had occurred at Mobile, in which two booksellers, William Strickland and E. Upson were driven out by a mob and Lynch Committee, on a vague charge of selling incendiary publications. "Is it not high time we had a Government?" exclaims the Tribune, in evident reference to the coming Presidential election. But pray, Mr. Tribune, how are we to get "a government intent on protecting the rights of liberty and property" at Mobile, by installing a President, an administration, and a party, "inflexible in the belief that slavery ought not to be interfered with, where it exists under the shield of State Sovereignty"? This is the published "belief" of Col. Fremont, read and applauded in the Convention at Philadelphia that nominated him.

WHAT WE HEARD.—We attended an enthusiastic "Republican" meeting, not long since, in which one of the orators brought down a thunder of applause, by the declaration that the single county he lived in might be relied upon to put down the threatened attempt of the slaveocrats to seize the National Capitol in case of the election of Fremont. In the next sentence he brought down an equally uproarious applause

by the declaration that the same county might be depended upon to defend the slaveholders against any invasion of their vested rights! "The Almighty," said Jefferson, "has no attributes that could take sides with us in such a contest."

#### Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1856.

For President,  
GERRIT SMITH, OF NEW YORK.

For Vice-President,  
SAMUEL MCFARLAND, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

#### PREREQUISITES OF CANDIDATES—SAGACITY OF VOTERS.

"Every few days, some supporter of Fillmore greets us with the assumption that we oppose him because of his signing the Fugitive Slave Bill, or because of his inclining to pro-slavery, Union-saving, and negro-catching, while President. We beg leave to assure them that it is no such thing. It is not our custom to quarrel about bygones. 'Let the dead bury their dead.' If Mr. Fillmore stood to-day on the Free-soil platform—if he were the candidate of the party of Freedom, we should support him right heartily, notwithstanding his past short-comings. But he stands on the opposite principle of letting slavery legalize itself in every Territory where it can obtain a foothold—the principle of oppression, and darkness, and diabolism—and therefore we oppose him, and not because of any bygone differences. We beg that this be once and for ever understood."—*N. Y. Tribune*, Sept. 30.

There is no pretence that Mr. Fillmore has repented of his misdeeds—that he is less inclined to "pro-slavery and negro catching" than while he was President. The Tribune's supposition, and its conditions on which it would support Mr. Fillmore, include nothing of the kind. The Tribune records the anti-slavery professions of Mr. Fillmore while a candidate for northern votes, in 1838,—his professed opposition to the annexation of Texas, his pledge to advocate the abolition of slavery in the Federal District, and the slave trade between the States.—He tells us how, in 1848, when Mr. Fillmore was a candidate for the Vice Presidency, "one of the strong arguments with free-soilers was, that, in case of an equal division in the Senate, on the great issue of slavery and freedom, Mr. Fillmore would give the casting vote for freedom."

Yes! And the New York Tribune was among the chief mediums of this kind advice to free-soilers and abolitionists. Four years previous, the Editor, as he tells us, had spent a week in Washington urging the nomination of Mr. Fillmore for the Vice Presidency, and had failed. And now, after having suffered the mortification, (as we must charitably presume,) of having been thus instrumental in misleading the votes of free-soilers and abolitionists into the support of a politician so heartless, so recreant, so untrue to all his anti-slavery professions, one who has done so much to bring the nation into its present deplorable condition—one who now, as the Tribune records, advises the South to commit treason, if defeated in the Presidential election: the Tribune feels scandalized at the imputation of its being opposed, at all, to Mr. Fillmore, on the score of his past history! If that wily fox had been at home for the year or two past, and had had the wit to foresee that "free Kansas" would prove a more "available"



rallying cry than "the rise of niggers," then the New York Tribune would as readily have raised the flag of Fillmore, again, advising free soilers and abolitionists to vote for him, as it now raises the flag of Fremont. The fugitive slave bill is a "bygone," and it "quarrels not about bygones." In selecting candidates, it ignores their past history.

There's progress for you, "one step at a time," with a witness! Next year, the Kansas question may be a "bygone," and Atchinson and Stringfellow, four years hence, may be "available" candidates, provided they may deem it politic to pledge themselves against the forcible enslavement of Minnesota.

Seriously! Have old fashioned earnestness and common sagacity become "bygones"?—Are we to go into the culture of bramble bushes in order to grow grapes? To secure a supply of figs, are we to transplant and prune thistles? To find out who it is best to vote for, in order to secure liberty, shall we inquire of the New York Tribune? Shall we run after its Fillmores, its Websters, its Clays, its Fremonts?

"REPUBLICAN" PROGRESS,— "NON-EXTENSION ABANDONED—NO REPEAL OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL—NO RESTRICTION AGAINST SLAVERY IN KANSAS—"PEACE" ON THE BASIS OF THE COMPROMISE OF 1850.

Extracts from the Speech of N. P. BANKS, JR. in Wall street, Sept. 25, as reported in the N. Y. Tribune:

"With the institution of slavery in the States, we have nothing to do. I know I speak the sentiments that animate the hearts of all men here, when I say that we are determined to interfere, in no wise, at no time, and to no extent, with the sectional, local, and traditional rights of the South. [Loud cheers.] But if they choose, by their own volition, to make this charge, I trust that there is not an intelligent man here, interested in the welfare and prosperity of New York, that will have any thing to say against it. [Applause.] It is a work for them, and not for us. I repel the charge that we intend to interfere with their affairs, as a base slander. Such an intention animates no considerable class in any Northern portion of this confederacy." . . . "The question is not that we shall legislate against the South upon the question of slavery. It is not that we shall legislate upon the question of the Fugitive Slave bill. We don't raise the question whether, in the future extension of our territory, Slavery shall be prohibited or no. We abandon all these questions, and we stand upon this distinct simple proposition, that that which gave peace to the country in 1820, (1) and that which secured the peace of the country in 1850, ought to be made good by the Government of the United States with the consent of the American people. That is all we ask—no more, no less, no better and no worse—that the spirit of the acts of 1820 and 1850 (2) shall be made good by the American people of the South, let me say, as well as the North, in the place of the conflagration, murder, and civil war that now prevail in Kansas. To do this, no legislation is required, and it is not necessary that the halls of Congress should be again opened to agitation. (3) We desire the election of a President of the United States with simple views and determined will, who will exert the influence of the Government in that portion of the territory of the United States, and allow the people of this country\* to settle the question of slavery for themselves there. [Applause.] We ask no man more than

this, and when we have succeeded in the Presidential election before us, as in the grace of God we shall and will succeed [great applause], and the fact is proclaimed that Fremont is elected, Kansas will be again restored to freedom without legislative act or the interference of the hand of Government in any way. [Applause.] (4) So much, gentlemen, for the remedy in regard to Kansas, that we propose. (5) It is a simple, feasible, and statesmanlike proposition. Effect the settlement of this question, and you remove a question of agitation, and give again the peace which it enjoyed in 1852. I should do wrong to our cause, the cause of the Northern States, if I failed to say that there are other influences we desire to exert by the elevation to the Presidency of the man of our choice. We ask that the dead weight of human wrong shall be lifted up from the continent again, that it may rise as it was rising before these acts of wrong were done. [Applause.] We ask of you, fellow citizens of New York, four years of quiet and peace, so that we may again proceed to the development of the material interests of that portion of the continent which we occupy." (6)

NOTES.

(1) This is an explicit abandonment of the "non-extension" policy, and a repudiation of the Free Soil platform of "No more slave States." It is, moreover, an explicit endorsement and approbation of the "Compromise measures of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave bill!

(2) Our own notes of this passage, (for we heard this portion of the speech,) include a little more than is reported by the Tribune. Mr. Banks, as we understood him, spoke of the "compromise measures of 1850," (which include the Fugitive Slave Bill) as having been "adjusted by the united wisdom of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun!"

(3) Are we to understand, by this, that no attempt is to be made in Congress, to prohibit slavery in the Territory of Kansas? Are all the lucid arguments in the "Republican" papers, distinguishing between the power of Congress to prohibit slavery in the States, and the power to prohibit it in the Territories—(denying the former, and affirming the latter)—to be given up, as untenable? Are we to be thrown back upon the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty" again, after all the Republicans have said against it? And is "bleeding Kansas" to be left to fight it out, for herself, as she best can? Let us read on, and see.

(4) Yes! That is it, evidently, if words have any meaning at all! Col. Fremont, if elected, is simply to do as Gov. Geary, in compliance with the wishes of Buchanan, is trying or pretending to do, keeping "hands off," and holding an even scale between Liberty and Slavery in Kansas.

(5) As much as to say—This is the whole of our protection for Kansas.—We propose nothing more.

(6) "Four years of quiet and peace"—let the question of "freedom in Kansas" turn which way it will—so that we can go about our money-making again!

"REPUBLICANISM" OF H. WARD BEECHER.

"The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher addressed an attentive audience of 1200 people at Orange, N. J., on Monday evening, at the Republican Club House.—The address of Mr. B. was an earnest, eloquent, and powerful appeal in behalf of the Republican cause and its candidates. 'I would not,' said Mr. B., 'if I had the power, lay the weight of my little finger, politically, upon South Carolina, to take from her the least right she holds under our Constitution, much as I

hate that system to which she clings with such tenacity. She is fully entitled to all the rights she has under the Constitution, without let or hindrance, and in those rights she must and shall be protected.' A large number of ladies were present, and the whole audience were delighted and pleased."—N. Y. Tribune, Oct. 8.

The plain meaning is that South Carolina must be "protected" in the "right, under the Constitution," to maintain slavery! The Republican party, as Mr. Beecher understands it, is pledged to do this. If the slaves in the States should arm themselves with "Sharp's rifles" for the purpose of "self-defence," just as "white" men have been doing in Kansas, the Republican party, if it "protects" those "constitutional rights," must send Federal troops to put down the slaves. But Mr. Jefferson says, "the Almighty has no attribute that could take sides with us in such a contest."

Can it be that Mr. Beecher means to carry the idea of "protection" thus far? If not, where will he draw the line of distinction? Will he say that he would only have South Carolina "protected" from the physical interference of Northern abolitionists, in the matter? How then can he justify the interference of Northern men in sending "Sharp's rifles" to the Free State men, in Kansas? Will he say that Northern citizens belong to the same nation with the people of Kansas, and therefore owe them protection? Then I ask, do not Northern men belong to the same nation with the colored people of South Carolina, and do they not therefore owe them protection? Will he say that there is no law for slavery in Kansas, nor for "Border ruffian" outrages upon free state men? Then I tell him that there is no law for slavery in South Carolina, and among my witnesses, I will cite Judge Matthews, Judge Porter, John C. Calhoun, Senators Mason and Toombs, Gen. Stringfellow and the Southern editors generally.

But the "Constitution"—as Mr. Beecher thinks, protects the "state right" of maintaining slavery. Does it? Where is the clause that protects it? Is it this—"No state shall pass any bill of attainder, or ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligations of contracts, nor grant any title of nobility?" Or is it this—"The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government?" Or is it this—"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law?"

But if the Constitution does "protect" the "state right" of maintaining slavery, how can Mr. Beecher, as a Christian man, who hates and condemns slavery, support the Constitution? Why does he not either go for a dissolution of the Union? or, (what would be more consistent, patriotic and Christian) why does he not urge the Christian duty of over-riding the Constitution, (which, if he construes it correctly, the people of the United States had no moral right to make,) the duty of "delivering the spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor," and of "proclaiming liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof?" Will he deny that the slave states belong to the same nation with us? Will he deny that American slavery is a National sin? Will he deny that God holds nations responsible for National sins—particularly for the National sin of tolerating oppression? Will he plead that the people of the United States, while constituting one nation, have nevertheless devised so skilful and cunning a Constitution of government, that although God holds and always has held every other nation responsible for the National sin of tolerating, (or not abolishing) oppression, yet he will nevertheless make an exception, in the case of this nation, on account of our very "peculiar" system of government?

And will he tell us from whence the "state right" of South Carolina to maintain slavery is derived? and whether it be from the Declaration of Independence, the Colonial Charters, the British Constitution, or the Common Law of England?

Furthermore, if "these rights must and shall be protected" by the Republican party, will he tell us

\* The New York Herald's report has it—"so as to allow its people to settle the question for themselves, there." This was evidently the meaning.



whether they will enforce the Fugitive Slave Bill? Or if not, what becomes of the "protection" afore-said, and of the principle upon which it is founded?

"IS NOT THIS MOCKERY?"

The New York Daily Tribune of September 23, has an able leader in which the Editor exposes the mockery offered to the Free State settlers in Kansas, by Governor Geary, in his Inaugural address.

"Let us all begin anew. Let the past be buried 'in oblivion,' says the Governor. 'Very good,' responded the People; 'that is just what we desire. Let us rub out the Slave Code imposed on us by Border-Ruffian invasion, and take a fresh, fair start.' 'Oh! not at all,' says the Governor, that 'will never do. You must submit unreservedly to the Ruffian Code, and repeal it if you can by-and-by.' Hear him!

"I cheerfully admit that the people of this Territory under the Organic Act, have the absolute right of making their municipal laws, and, from citizens who deem themselves aggrieved by recent legislation, I would invoke the utmost forbearance, and point out to them a sure and peaceable remedy. You have the right to ask the next Legislature to revise any and all laws: and in the mean time, as you value the peace of the Territory and the maintenance of future laws, I would earnestly ask you to refrain from all violation of the present statutes.

"I am sure there is patriotism sufficient in the people of Kansas to lend a willing obedience to the law. All the provisions of the Constitution of the United States must be sacredly observed, all the acts of Congress having reference to this Territory must be unhesitatingly obeyed, and the decision of our Courts respected. It will be my imperative duty to see that these suggestions are carried into effect."

If this is not mockery, is not swindling, what could be? The people of Kansas are required to submit to usurpation and the overthrow of their dearest rights, on the ground that they will by-and-by have a chance to vote, under election laws framed by the invaders with the express purpose of perpetuating their sway—laws which disfranchise most of the Free State settlers, while extending the Right of Suffrage to invaders not yet a day in the Territory, and putting the polls and the canvass completely in the hands of the Missouri party. If under such mockery of the name of law the settlers can overthrow the Missouri despotism, they may; if not, they must submit to it unreservedly and indefinitely. And meantime, Slavery is already established in Kansas by the acts of the bogus Legislature, and will go on strengthening and fortifying its position while the settlers are struggling for their own liberties, until the time for uprooting it will have passed away forever. Such is the deceitful idol whose grinning front Gov. Geary would label Popular Sovereignty—*New York Tribune*.

A very strong case, certainly. But it strikes us that, with incidental variations, it very nearly resembles another case that might be stated.—There are three or four millions of slaves in a much worse condition than the Free State men in Kansas. And they have been in that condition, for a long time. Here, too, are the abolitionists who profess to "remember them that are in bonds as bound with them."—The "Republican" party comes along, proposing to take charge of the National Government and expecting the friends of the slave to help vote its candidates into office. The leaders of the party speak brave words against "the Slave Power." That Power, say they, must be put down. "Very good," respond the slaves, and their advocates, "that is just what we desire. Let us rub out the Slave Code imposed upon us by the slaveholding Ruffians and take a fresh start."—"Oh! not at all," say the "Republicans" and their candidate. "That will never do. You must

submit unreservedly, to that Ruffian Code, and repeal it by-and-by." "If this is not mockery, is not swindling, what could be?"

Let the reader imagine himself a slave, or identified with the slave, in his sympathies, and he will feel as well as see the parallel.

The Bogus Kansas Slave Code cannot be more completely void of all legal or constitutional validity, than are the Slave Codes of the South. They are not more notoriously or more completely founded on fraud and violence.—The Free State men in Kansas who should allow himself to act and vote under them, would not be more completely ensnared, entangled, and self-manacled than would the slave, or the slave's next friend, (the abolitionist) who should allow himself to vote for the Presidential Candidate who is "inflexible in the belief that it (slavery) ought not to be interfered with, where it exists under the shield of state sovereignty."

"If present submission to the Slave Code in Kansas," be fatal to the effort to "repeal it, if you can, by-and-by," how much more evidently would a direct vote in favor of the Slave Code in the States, be fatal to the effort to "repeal it, if you can, by-and-by."—It is bad enough to "submit" to the Slave Code. It is much worse to vote for it, and become one of its enactors.

"STATE SOVEREIGNTY."

President Pierce told the Kansas Committee—"That Government has not the power to protect emigrants en route for the Territory, because of the jurisdiction of the States; consequently, outrages committed on the highways of the nation can only be redressed by the Courts of the respective States on whose soil such outrages were committed," (*vide N. Y. Tribune Sept. 3*).

Well suppose Col. Fremont and the Republican party were in power—how could they, with their "State Sovereignty" creed do anything different in the premises? If they could protect white liberty in the States, why could they not protect colored liberty in the States; President Pierce's answer to the Kansas Committee, atrocious as it was, seems only the natural result of the "State Sovereignty" theory, as held in common by the "Democrats" and the "Republicans."

SAYING AND DOING.—"Heartily concurring with my friends in the assertion of the power and duty of Congress, under the Constitution, to abolish slavery throughout the land, I have labored according to my ability, with tongue and pen, to transfuse my convictions into other minds."

So writes a correspondent of Frederick Douglass's paper, whose main object in writing is to give his reasons for voting with a party that refuses to take the position he has described. We fear his vote in the one direction will outweigh, in "other minds," his "tongue and pen" in the other direction. Men judge of each other's beliefs, by their doings.

For the Radical Abolitionist.

"OF WHAT USE IS IT TO INSIST ON THESE RADICAL DOCTRINES, JUST AT THIS CRISIS?"

Brother Goodell—This question is asked by many who are favorable to our views. We answer them briefly, and in substance thus: It is useful to tell the truth. It does the person good who tells it, and it will do good to some others. A few years since, a brother, now intimately associated with you in effort, talked the abolition doctrines to a fellow-passenger on a steamboat; that man was not convinced, but ALVAN STEWART overheard the conversation, and received the truth.

Many there are, who, in their honest zeal to resist the extension of slavery, inadvertently make most unfortunate concessions to slavery in the States; and our idea is, that, "just at this crisis," they should hear it boldly proclaimed, "There cannot be law for slavery." At this hour, when precious truth is obscured by sophistry, is exactly the time to assert that truth as explicitly as possible.

Yours,

J. R. J.

Coventry, R. I., Sept. 1, 1856.

#### VOICE OF THE REPUBLICAN PRESS.

"The Republican party is not an Abolition party. It is pledged to the protection of all our institutions where they exist. It defends the rights of the states. It leaves slavery where the Constitution leaves it. It goes for the Union even with slavery sanctioned by that Union. It does not propose to liberate a single slave. It will not interfere with a single state. It seeks to throw a barrier around soil now free, and keep it for the free white man forever. The Buchaneers and their twelfth section allies, are striving to wrest it from the white man, and give it forever to the nigger. The Republican party leaves 'niggers' where they are."—*Westchester (Pa.) Amer.*

OUR STATEMENTS CONFIRMED.—The N. Y. Herald, (in which the nomination of Col. Fremont was first proposed,) has the following:

"The Radical Abolitionist, the special organ of Gerrit Smith, the Abolition Candidate, devotes its entire October number to the enemies of slavery, and in urging them not to vote for Fremont. We give a brief extract to the point:—

"The Republican party is not a party for the deliverance of the enslaved, but only for the security of the free. It is not a party for the black man, but only for the white man. It is not a party for the rescue of the whole country from the despotism of the slave power, but only for the rescue of Kansas."

Whereupon the Herald responds—

"There is the case in a nutshell. The Fremont party is the 'white man's party'—it is neither a nigger party nor a nigger driving party, but the 'white man's party.' Its policy contemplates no interference with state rights, or the constitutional rights of slavery in the territories. None. It only aims to quash the Democratic nullifiers' policy of making Kansas a slave state by force of arms, and to substitute the Constitution as the supreme law. Nothing more."

"The person who asserts that Col. Fremont is an abolitionist, and that the Republican party is an abolition party, either does so through ignorance or knavishness. If the former, he is to be pitied; if the latter, he is worthy only of contempt."—*Circleville Herald (Fremont)*.

"The Evening Mirror of this city, a Fremont Journal, says, 'We regard Col. Fremont as the conservative candidate. We do not believe he will have a man in his Cabinet who is tainted or tainted either with abolitionism or secessionism. His party is an ultra Union party, and his election will quiet and consolidate the Republic.' The Mirror is a staunch supporter of the Compromises of 1850, the Fugitive Slave law included."—*A. S. Standard*.

"The present Republican movement is directed quite as much against the ultraism of abolition, as against the kindred ultraism of slavery."—*New York Times, Sept. 23*.

"It [the North] is still disposed to be at peace with slavery; to leave it, with all its 'blessings' and all its evils, to those who are afflicted with it." *Ib.*

"There is a point beyond which Freedom will not be pushed. Where that point is, we do not yet know. But the slave Power is determined to find it." *Ib.*

"The Election of Fremont would retard the cause of emancipation in the States."—*New York Evening Post, (a Fremont paper.)*

CORRECTIONS for our October number.

On page 18—second column—fifth line of the second paragraph, instead of "professing to break the fetters" read "proposing."

Same page—third column, 26th line from top, instead of "repeal of the Missouri Compromise," read "restoration."

Page 21—third column—bottom line read "charge of having passed the bill."

27th page—first column—bottom line read "inquiry whether" &c.

29th page—third column—third line from bottom, for "successor" read "successors."